



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/641,410	08/18/2000	Alice Mary O'Donnell-Kiely		7256

Alice O Kiely
71 Stonewall Court
Yorktown Heights, NY 10598-1819

7590

07/09/2009

EXAMINER

CHAWLA, JYOTI

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1794

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

07/09/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/641,410	Applicant(s) O'DONNELL-KIELY, ALICE MARY	
	Examiner JYOTI CHAWLA	Art Unit 1794	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 March 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 383-416 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 403-416 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 383-402 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Applicant's submission filed on March 16, 2009 has been entered as compliant. Previously examined claims 1-382 have been cancelled, and all new claims 383-416 are added to the current application. Claims 383-416 are pending and examined in the current application.

Note: To expedite prosecution applicant is requested to furnish support for the subject matter recited in the new and amended claims in the current application. Furthermore, the applicant is requested to recite the claims such that the rejections made under 35 USC 112 in the previous office actions are corrected.

Election/Restrictions

Newly submitted claims 403-416 are directed to a method of making a support, i.e., an invention that is independent or distinct from the invention elected in response filed January 18, 2003 to the original restriction requirement.

Since applicant had elected a product and not the method of making in response to the election requirement the method of making the product, i.e., claims 403-416 are withdrawn from consideration as being directed to a non-elected invention. See 37 CFR 1.142(b) and MPEP § 821.03. Thus claims 403-416 will not be examined in the present office action.

Thus, claims 383- 402 directed to the product, i.e., elected invention, will be examined in the present application.

Amendments to Specification

The amendment filed March 16, 2009, is once again objected to under 35 U.S.C. 132(a) because it introduces new matter into the disclosure. 35 U.S.C. 132(a) states that no amendment shall introduce new matter into the disclosure of the invention. The added

Art Unit: 1794

material which is not supported by the original disclosure is as follows: the addition of "composite material" in paragraphs [0043], [0044], [0164] and [0166], which was not disclosed in the specification as originally filed and has also been added to claims. The term "a composite material" as disclosed in the amendment would introduce new matter and change the description from "a candy bar " to "a composite material candy bar" in paragraph [0164], which is not the same as a generic term "candy bar" as originally described. Therefore, the amendments to the specification introduce new matter and the applicant is required to cancel the new matter in the reply to this Office Action.

Amendment to paragraph [0197], correcting a typographical error and replacing "caramel on top of the caramel" with "caramel on top of the cookie ~~caramel~~" does not introduce any new matter and would be entered if submitted separately.

Applicant's comment about cancelling the request to amend paragraph [0172] of the specification, is unclear as the applicant has not provided details of the original request to amend paragraph [0172] and any details as to whether the amendment was entered or not. Further, the record indicates applicant has request to amend paragraph [0171] but not paragraph [0172]. Applicant is requested to furnish more details about the date of submission, page number, paragraph etc., of the original request to amend paragraph [0172] for consideration.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112 (First paragraph)

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims (all pending) are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which

was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. In the instant case the term "composite material" as added to the claims introduces new matter as the term is not disclosed in the original disclosure and the introduction of the term "composite material" changes the description of "a candy bar " to "a composite material candy bar", which is not the same as a generic term "candy bar" as originally described. Other similar changes have been made throughout the claims, which are not supported by the original disclosure. Therefore, the amendments to the claims introduce new matter and the applicant is required to cancel the new matter in the reply to this Office Action.

Note: To expedite prosecution applicant is once again requested to furnish support for the newly added terms and phrase and subject matter recited in the new and amended claims in the current application. Furthermore, the applicant is requested to provide support where the claimed term or phrase is recited in the same context as it is being claimed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112 (Second paragraph)

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 383-402 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims are unclear for the recitation of "comprising a material comprising "two ingredient materials" , "single component", "constituent ingredient materials" as it is unclear as to what is encompassed by the terms "ingredient" and "material" and "ingredient material"

as it is used in claims. It is unclear as to how each of the terms “ingredient”, “constituent ingredient material” and material are different from “ingredient materials” as recited in claims. Thus, the claims use terms ingredient and material and “ingredient material” interchangeably which makes the claims unclear as recited for the purposes of prior art comparison. Clarification and/or correction is required.

Claims are indefinite for the recitation of relative terms “mini”, “mini size”, “bite size ingredient” of claims (e.g., claims 384, 386) The terms, “mini”, “mini size” or “bite size ingredient” have not defined by the claim, the specification does not provide a standard for ascertaining the requisite degree, and one of ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably apprised of the scope of the invention and said terms may have different meaning for different people e.g., bite size might be different for a small child as compared to an adult. Correction is required.

Claims are indefinite for the recitation of “composite material”. Applicant has not distinguished between the terms in the specification and thus the claim as recited is unclear as to what is the scope of the term composite material. It is unclear whether the claim requires materials that can form a composite or materials that are composites themselves or some other. The term “composite” recited is indefinite as it is unclear as to what the term composite refers to because even if a small part of edible support comprises a composite, then the entire support would be considered as a composite support and not just a part of the support would be designated as being a composite material or two ingredient material or two combined ingredient material. It is further unclear as to what relationship do terms like “a composite material”, “two edible ingredient materials”, “two combined ingredient materials” “composite ingredient comprising two combined edible ingredient materials” have to each other. Clarification and consistent use of the same terminology is requested. Correction is required to expedite the prosecution.

Further, a composite is defined as “made of separate elements”, i.e. made of more than one element, i.e. comprising a minimum of two ingredient materials. Thus,

applicant has chosen to redefine a known term. Where applicant acts as his or her own lexicographer to specifically define a term of a claim contrary to its ordinary meaning, the written description must clearly redefine the claim term and set forth the uncommon definition so as to put one reasonably skilled in the art on notice that the applicant intended to so redefine that claim term. *Process Control Corp. v. HydReclaim Corp.*, 190 F.3d 1350, 1357, 52 USPQ2d 1029, 1033 (Fed. Cir. 1999).

Double Patenting

Nonstatutory Provisional Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection based on claims of Applications 10/163,209 and 10/167,812 has been withdrawn based on applicant's abandonment of said applications.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

1) Claims **383-402** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Musher (US 2217700).

The references and rejection are incorporated herein and as cited in the previous office actions.

Regarding claims **383** and **394**, Musher teaches ice cream (frozen comestible) on a non-frozen edible support structure or a composite support which has at least two edible discernable (i.e. perceptible) edible confectionary materials or components that are

combined together to make the support, i.e., two constituent ingredient materials (Page 1: Column 1, lines 37-46 and Column 2 lines 40-55), as instantly claimed. Also see (Page 4: column 1, line 72 to Column 2, line 23 and figures 1-6).

The support as taught by Musher (figures 1-6) comprise of various individual edible ingredients, for example, cereal flakes, sugar, candy flakes or ribbons, grains, hard fat flakes or ribbons (Page 1, column 1 to Page 5, column 2, line 40; Page 5: Column 2, lines 46-56 and Page 6: Column 1, lines 35-47) that are combined to form the support. Thus, the edible support as taught by Musher comprises of plurality of ingredient materials that make a single component edible confectionary support, as recited in claims **389** and **400**. The end of the stick may include a lollipop that is also connected structure pieces (Page 5: column 1, lines 26-33 and 54-65), which may include items such as nuts or even a plurality of candy pieces (page 3: Column 2, lines 14-21 and Page 5: Column 2, lines 24-35), which would constitute as bite size ingredients in a multi component edible support as recited in claims **386, 393, 397** and **402**. The lollipop as taught by Musher is a bite size ingredient, placed inside or embedded in the confection, as recited in **386, 393, 397** and **402**. Further since a plurality of ingredients are combined in the support as taught by Musher, the support comprises of composite ingredient materials and various combinations of ingredients that form the support, as recited in claims **384-387, 390, 392, 395-397, 399-401**.

The structure pieces i.e., before forming into a three dimensional composite support (Page 4: column 1, line 72 to Column 2, line 23) may be coated in hard fat (fluid ingredient), which prevents the transfer of moisture and improve the adhesion or grip of the frozen comestible (Page 3: Column 2 lines Page 5: Column 1 , lines 65 to Column 2, line 2), i.e., moisture resistant barrier as recited in claims **384** and **395** or a coating as recited in claims **393** and **402**.

The support for a frozen confection as taught by Musher is made to be held in hand , (see figures 1-6), and may be made of stick, which can be either entirely edible or part inedible, which acts as a handle or support, as recited in claims **387-388, 393, 398-399** and **402**.

Musher also teaches of a support for a frozen comestible, which comprises of two edible ingredient materials, which include a homogenous material such as candy, a composite material with one or more ingredients, for supporting the frozen comestible, as recited in claim **390**. The ingredients as taught by Musher comprise a support wherein one portion of the support extends into the ice cream and the other portion extends out of the ice cream for holding the frozen confection vertically i.e., the support forms a handle for an individual to hold a frozen comestible with (See figures 1-6 and Page 2: Column 2, lines 20-25; Page 3: Column 1 line 70-Column 2 line 5). Also see Page 6: Column 1, lines 4-70; Page 2, Column 2, line 4 to Page 3, Column 1, line 60) a handle as recited in claims **388** and **398**.

Regarding the edible hollow confection length and filling, as recited in claim **391** Musher teaches of voids or hollow in the edible support, structure which is filled with chocolate or sugar syrup and confection bits and all of this composite support structure has a common centre, i.e., the ingredient materials are placed concentrically as recited in claim **391**. Musher further teaches that the structure pieces around the lollipop, which include candy, can be placed concentrically (i.e. a circle around the lollipop) or maneuvered in some other manner on the support to improve the strength of the support, (page 5: Column 1, lines 45-54 and Column 2, lines 24-35). Musher also teaches that the finished product or the composite formed support can be coated with chocolate or sprinkled with other flavoring material, i.e., enrobed or dipped with ingredient which is fluid (Page 3: Column 2, lines 25-30). Thus, Musher teaches of support for frozen comestible wherein the support has edible hollow spaces or voids with edible filling placed in said voids, as recited in claim **391**.

Thus the invention as recited in claims 383-402 are anticipated by Musher.

2) Claims 383-390, 392-402 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Feybusch (US 1638480).

Art Unit: 1794

Feybusch teaches edible cones for the support of frozen confections such as ice creams or sundaes, i.e., edible support. The support or cone taught by Feybusch comprises of two ingredient materials, i.e., cone making pastry material (such as sugar, flour etc) and edible adhesive material, such as, molasses (Page 1, lines 55-63), and popcorn or nuts or brittle or puffed rice, (Page 1, lines 20-30), i.e., grains, confections, nuts as instantly claimed. The ingredients sugar, water and flour etc., that are typical ingredients of the pastry cone (i.e., edible confectionary material) as taught by Feybusch comprise an ingredient in the support as recited in claims **383-385** and **394-396**.

Regarding claims **385, 386, 392-393, 395-397** and **401**, on page 1, lines 57-65, Feybusch teaches of plurality of ingredient materials including confection and fluid component, a flavored sugar, a colored sugar, which is also coating and binding component or ingredient (i.e., molasses), grain or cereal or crisped rice (i.e., popcorn, puffed rice), edible confectionary material, an edible material comprising two ingredient materials (i.e., pastry cone, nut brittle), nuts comprise at least two edible ingredient materials that are bite size, mini and are enclosed or embedded in the edible support by using molasses as recited in claims **385, 386, 392-393, 395-397** and **401**.

Regarding the edible support comprising a composite material as recited in claims **390** and **394**, Feybusch teaches of pastry cone (composite material) and nut brittle or popcorn with molasses, each of these have two ingredient materials within edible composite material, e.g., pastry cone has flour and sugar, nut brittle has sugar and nuts, (Feybusch Figures 1 and 2 and page 1), which makes Feybusch's support comprising composite material or two ingredient materials in the support as instantly claimed. Further, as taught by Feybusch, each of the components, such as, pastry cone, comprises a single component of the edible support for a frozen confection, as recited in claims **389** and **400**.

Regarding claims **387-388** and **398-399**, the finished cone as taught by Feybusch is a support for a frozen confection, such as, ice-cream. Also the edible cone can be held in hand, which is a handle (handle: a part of a thing made specifically to be grasped or held by the hand). Thus the cone as taught by Feybusch comprises a non-frozen support which is a handle as instantly claimed.

Regarding the recitation of support further comprising a frozen comestible as recited in claims **393** and **402**, Feybusch teaches of support for a frozen comestible, such as, ice cream. The details of Figure 3 show a picture of ice cream on top of the cone. Feybusch also teaches that the ice confection is highly palatable in the edible support containing with molasses with popcorn or peanuts or rice (Page 1, lines 85-95).

Thus, the invention as recited in claims 383-390, 392-402 are anticipated by Feybusch.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

(A) Claim 391 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Feybusch in view of Lane et al (US 1690984), hereinafter Lane.

Regarding the limitation of “wherein one of the two constituent materials comprises an edible hollow confection length, wherein the other of the said two constituent materials comprises an edible filling placed in said hollow length” as recited in claim 391.

Feybusch teaches of a composite support for frozen confection (See figures 1 and 2 of Feybusch). The reference however, is silent as to having one of the two constituent materials comprises an edible hollow confection length, wherein the other of the said two constituent materials comprises an edible filling placed in said hollow length, as recited in claim 391. However, support for the frozen confections, wherein one material creates a hollow area which is filled with the other component was well known in the art at the time of the invention. For example Lane teaches of support for a frozen confection comprising of two layers of confection (See items 10 and 11 of Figure 3 of Lane and Page 1, lines 26-34), which have space in between the layers (Item 12, Figure 3 and Page 1, lines 30-33), the space 12 can receive icing, filling of sweetened cream or other confection (Page 1, lines 30-34). Thus, edible support for frozen confections with one material forming a hollow space and the other confection forming the filling as taught by Lane was well known at the time of the invention. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Feybusch based on the teachings from Lane and make the edible support comprising one material that has hollow confection length and another component that comprises a filling placed in said hollow length (Lane Page 1, lines 26-34). One of ordinary skill would have been motivated to modify Feybusch at least for the purpose of rendering the edible support more desirable and tasty (Lane, Page 1, lines 9-14).

Claim 391, is unpatentable over Feybusch in view of Lane.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's submission of Jan 16, 2009 and March 16, 2009, cancelling all the claims examined in the previous non-final office action and adding all new claims 383-416 have been considered. Claims 383-402 have been examined above and claims 403-416 have been withdrawn from consideration as being directed to a non-elected invention. Applicant's remarks are addressed to the new claims, which have been rejected above and thus are moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.

I) Regarding the support for the terms rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, applicant has presented no comments and although the applicant has removed the rejected claims, the newly added claims continue to be unclear for the reasons of record. For expediting the prosecution in future, the applicant is requested to provide support in the original disclosure of the present application for future reference.

II) Applicant's remarks regarding Musher have been fully considered but are not persuasive. Applicant's remarks have also been responded in previous office action dated April, 30, 2008.

a) Specifically regarding Musher not teaching a two ingredient support (Remarks, page 36), applicant is referred to the claim as recited "support....comprising two edible ingredient materials", the term comprising is open ended and does not convey that the support have only two edible ingredient materials. Further since the applicant has failed to show how the two ingredient materials are different from an ingredient in the support as stated in claims, therefore it is unclear as to what constitutes an ingredient or an ingredient material as recited. Also see the rejection of claims under 35 USC 112 above. Further, it is noted that the applicant also states "Musher's composite support structure is made up of plurality of edible ...components" (Remarks, page 36-37) and "each of the framework structures are bonded together to make the framework structure" (Remarks, page 9, paragraph following Example V of 1/28/08). Thus the applicant admits that plurality of components come together to make the support structure as taught by Musher.

b) Regarding applicant's argument that "Musher's composite support structure is made up of plurality of edible ...components" (Remarks, page 36) and "framework structure comprises one material... and not two ingredient materials" (Remarks, page 9, paragraph following Example V of 1/28/08). Further the applicant alleges that components, such as, baked dough constitute a single material and do not qualify as a two ingredient material. In response the applicant is reminded that a material, such as, baked dough, also comprises of ingredients including flour, water, salt or sugar or fats or oils and other flavors or additives, thus applicant's argument that none of the components in Musher's support structure are two ingredient materials is unsubstantiated and not persuasive.

c) Regarding applicant's argument that Musher's composite support structure is made up of components and not materials (Remarks, pages 36-37) a component is a constituent part; element; ingredient and a material is the substance or substances of which a thing is made or composed. Thus by definition all components are constituent parts or materials with which a thing is made, in the instant case a support for a frozen confection. Thus applicant's argument is not persuasive.

d) Regarding the argument that Musher's support is not non-frozen the applicant is reminded that the baked support and the flakes and nuts etc., as taught by Musher make the composite support structure, which comprises voids where the ice-cream mixture is poured and frozen. Applicant is further referred to page 4 of Musher, where Musher teaches molding of stick and other flake material into a support structure for the frozen confection and forming the structure and coating it. The formed and coated support structure of Musher is non-frozen prior to addition of liquid and freezing steps. Thus the composite support for a frozen confection as taught by Musher is not-frozen until the ice cream material is poured into the voids and the entire structure is frozen.

III) Applicant's remarks regarding Feybusch have been considered and are moot in view of new grounds of rejection.

IV) Applicant's claim for new and unexpected results has been considered however applicant's remarks have materials and ingredients that have not been claimed as such and the applicant also claims of obtaining unique results by using commonly known and used components . Further the remarks offer no new data or experimentation that provides any evidence of the unexpected results. Thus applicant's remarks are not persuasive and claims 383-402 are rejected for reasons of record. Thus applicant's remarks have been fully considered but have not been found persuasive and claims 383-402 have been rejected for reasons of record.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JYOTI CHAWLA whose telephone number is (571)272-8212. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00 am to 5:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Keith Hendricks can be reached on (571) 272-1401. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

JC
Examiner
Art Unit 1794

/KEITH D. HENDRICKS/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1794